



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/629,595

07/30/2003

Emmanuelle Moisy

11016-0017

6220

22902

7590

08/07/2006

CLARK & BRODY
1090 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
SUITE 250
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

REDMAN, JERRY E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3634

DATE MAILED: 08/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/629,595

Applicant(s)

MOISY ET AL.

Examiner

Jerry Redman

Art Unit

3634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Claims 17, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 17, line 2, the phraseology "a hidden frame type" is not readily understood by the Examiner. Exactly what is a "hidden frame type"? In claim 18, line 2, there is a lack of antecedent basis for "the single-flange type". Exactly what is a "single flange type"? In claim 20, the applicant recites a "first reinforcing element" and a "second reinforcing means". Exactly what is the applicant trying to claim? Consistency should be maintained throughout the claims.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 6-9, 11-13, and 17-20 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Weimar (4,542,610). As shown in Figure 7, Weimar ('610) discloses a weatherstrip having a rigid thermo plastic reinforcing clip (4) having a web and two connecting jaws and at least one reinforcing means (18) located any where along the reinforcing clip (4) (column 5, lines 19-37). Weimar ('610) further discloses a retaining abutment (51) and an accommodating lip (the bottom portion in Figure 7 and/or the lip 40 as shown in Figure 6).

Art Unit: 3634

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 14, and 17-19 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gopalan et al. (2002/0144466A1). As shown in Figure 13, Gopalan et al. (2002/0144466A1) disclose a weatherstrip having a rigid thermo plastic reinforcing clip (10) formed of polypropylene and having a web and two connecting jaws with at least one planar reinforcing means (43 and/or 60) located along the jaw, a retaining abutment (the ridge portion situated between the jaws).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 6-13, 15, 16, and 17-20 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guillon (4,970,102) in view of Weimar ('610). As shown in Figure 4, Guillon ('102) discloses a weatherstrip (40) having a rigid thermo plastic reinforcing clip having a web (54) and two connecting jaws connected thereto, sealing lips 44 and 45) connected to the jaws, an abutment means (52) engaging the flange portions. Guillon ('102) fails to disclose a reinforcing means located in at least one of the jaws. Weimar ('610) discloses the use of reinforcing means (18) located at any position along a weatherstrip (column 5, line 19-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the weatherstrip of Guillon ('102) with a reinforcing means as taught by Weimar ('610) since a reinforcing

Art Unit: 3634

means provides extra rigidity to the weatherstrip along portions which need strengthened.


The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. patent to Weichman (4,517,233) and U.S. patent to McManus et al. (5,143,666) disclose a weatherstrip having reinforcing elements/means along both a top web portion and along vertical side portions similar to that of the applicant's invention.

The applicant's arguments have been considered but are not deemed persuasive. It appears that the applicant's arguments are more limiting than that of the claims. The applicant appears to be arguing that the weatherstrip of Weimar functions differently than that of the applicant's claimed invention yet the applicant has failed to provide this limitation within the claims. Furthermore, the applicant argues that Gopalan is "vague" in its disclosure. The disclosure of Gopalan appears straightforward and the Examiner doesn't understand why and/or how the applicant finds this particular reference "vague" when it is clear that the drawings themselves would be enough to understand that the applicant's claimed invention stills reads on Gopalan. With respect to Guillon, it appears that the applicant argues the process in which Guillon is made and not the reference per se.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jerry Redman at telephone number 571-272-6835.



Jerry Redman
Primary Examiner